

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner is of the opinion that Nakano, 6147923 does show the use of inverter 32 to drive the series-connected capacitors 13 and 18 to pump up the VOUT, at initial state as shown in Fig. 2(A) both capacitors 13 and 18 being driven to an on-state boosting the VOUT voltage up to VCC because the midpoint voltage VM has nothing to do with the series-connected capacitors 13 and 18.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that, the midpoint voltage VM has nothing to do with the series-connected capacitors 13 and 18, is not appropriate. In the abstract of Nakano, "...In an initial state, VM is at 0V and VE and VOUT is at VCC. Next the node of VM becomes a floating state and VE is lowered to 0V. Finally the node of VM is raised to VCC to boost VOUT from VCC up to $VCC(2+\alpha)$, where $0 < \alpha < 1$." According to the above description, the midpoint voltage VM is important to the voltage boosting circuit 10A because the VM changes (0V, floating state, VCC) with different situations (initial state, drop of voltage VE, Boosting VOUT). Hence, the middle point voltage control circuit 20 and the end point voltage control circuit 30 are essentially needed to control the VM and the VE, respectively. Compared with Nakano, there are no middle point voltage control circuit 20 and the end point voltage control circuit 30 in present invention because the node between the MOS transistor 211 and the storage cell 212 has no need to be controlled. Besides, Nakano doesn't teach the use of DRAM cell capacitor 21 as present invention.

According to the above reasons, a person skilled in the art has no suggestion or motivation to omit the middle point voltage control circuit 20 and the end point voltage control circuit 30 of Nakano. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In the light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits those pending Claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed that art cited but relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant has concluded that this cited reference do not affect the patentability of these claims as currently presented. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. R. Barkume". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

Anthony R. Barkume
Attorney for Applicant
Reg No. 33,831

June 29, 2006

20 Gateway Lane
Manorville, NY 11949
631-259-9099